REMARKS

Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for consideration of the subject patent application. This amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed September 8, 2004.

Claims 1-20 were originally presented. Claims 1-12 and 20 have been cancelled, and claims 13-19 were rejected and remain in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 13-19 (including independent claim 13) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kay (US 6,223,166). Applicant would like to discuss the prior art patents of Kay and Gobburu, and then the claims of the present invention will be contrasted with Kay and Gobburu.

Kay discloses a hybrid ticket system that allows a user to electronically purchase a ticket from the Internet using a desktop computer or using a kiosk. Then the user can print a hardcopy of the ticket on a piece of paper. Kay's tickets also include a cypher in the ticket that will be decoded or decrypted by a handheld ticket reader using an asymmetric or symmetric key.

Gobburu discloses an electronic ticket that can be displayed on a cell phone or PDA and the ticket can be scanned in for event entry (FIG. 2).

In contrast, the pending claims in the present invention recite a method for using an electronic ticket that can be displayed on the screen of a portable computing device to provide additional amenities to a holder of an accepted ticket. For example, a user may attend a sporting event and then maps, food, programs, directories or other items may be available to the user based on the acceptance of the electronic ticket. These additional amenities provide an incentive

for users to use and purchase electronic tickets on their cell phones and PDAs. This in turn reduces overall ticket printing and distribution costs for a vendor.

Claim 13 of the present invention includes "providing amenities to a ticket user based on the accepted ticket" in combination with steps of facilitating, downloading and accepting an electronic ticket. Kay and Gobburu do not teach or suggest providing amenities along with an accepted electronic ticket. Specifically, Gobburu provides entrance to an event but does not provide additional amenities to the ticket holder in combination with the electronically approved ticket.

Claim 14 includes the patentably distinct subject matter of "providing a discount for concession items available at the ticketed event via a ticket receiving unit." The prior art does not teach or suggest being able to provide a discount for a concession item in combination with an electronic ticket that can be optically accepted by a ticket receiving unit. When combined with claim 1, this allows a user to optically communicate the electronic ticket to the ticket receiving unit and receive a discount for a concession item during the event. This method can benefit a user because the user can stand at the entrance of a sporting event and purchase an electronic ticket wirelessly over the Internet. Then the user can provide that ticket to the ticket receiving unit just a few seconds later for entry to the sporting event and later receive a related amenity.

Claim 15 includes the step of, "providing an event map via remote communication wherein the electronic ticket allows the event map to be downloaded and activated." The prior art of Kay or Gobburu does not teach or suggest downloading an event map in response to an electronic ticket at an event. In addition, the prior office actions do not appear to have addressed

this issue directly. Claim 19 further includes the step of "providing a map that is customizable based on the electronic ticket." The prior art does not teach or suggest providing a customizable map.

Claim 16 includes the step of, "providing directions to a person's seat at the ticketed event using the electronic ticket." The prior art of Kay or Gobburu does not teach or suggest providing directions to a person's seat at an event and in combination with a downloadable and optically communicated ticket. This element of the present claim allows an owner of a facility to reduce labor costs because fewer ushers may be need to provide seating directions.

Claim 17 further claims, "providing directions" that are "based on the location of a ticket receiving unit where the person entered the ticketed event". The prior art of Kay or Gobburu do not teach or suggest providing directions electronically to a user at an event in combination with a downloaded and optically communicated ticket. The directions are also based on the location where the user entered an event building. Moreover, this operation cannot be provided with a paper ticket because the user of the paper ticket does not have an electronic device to receive the electronic seat directions.

Claim 18 includes the patentably distinct limitation of "providing an electronic event program via remote communication" based on the electronic ticket. The prior art of Kay and Gobburu do not teach or suggest supplying an electronic event program in combination with a downloaded and optically accepted ticket.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 13-19 are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejections and objections be withdrawn, that the claims be allowed and passed to issue. If any impediment to the allowance of these claims remains after entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to call Steve M. Perry at (801)566-6633 so that such matters may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee or to credit any overpayment in connection with this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

DATED this 8th day of December, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve M. Perry

Registration No. 45,357

THORPE NORTH & WESTERN, LLP

Customer No. 20,551

P.O. Box 1219

Sandy, Utah 84091-1219

Telephone: (801) 566-6633

H:\FILES\T9000\T9780\T9780 Amendment3 120804.doc